

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code |
|--|
| <p>Degree to which media are perceived to be reporting on elections in a conflict- and gender-sensitive manner</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 17204</p> |
| 2. Technical Details |
| <p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Qualitative scale.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Qualitative; Perception-based; Actual (ex-post).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It is typically used to measure results such as “Improved quality and inclusiveness in elections”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Mandatory: By sex: Female; Male; Intersex.</p> |
| 3. Description |
| <p>This indicator captures the perceived quality of electoral reporting in terms of its sensitivity to conflict dynamics and gender-related issues. It reflects how individuals, particularly those targeted by EU/FPI-supported interventions, assess whether the media’s coverage of electoral processes avoids exacerbating tensions and includes balanced, non-stereotyped representation of all genders. The indicator is especially relevant in fragile, polarised, or post-conflict contexts where media content can influence peace, trust in institutions, and inclusive democratic participation. It is aligned with EU priorities on gender equality, conflict prevention, and credible electoral processes.</p> |
| 4. Calculation of Values and Example |
| <p>This indicator is measured through a qualitative assessment, using the following five-point scale: 1. To no extent, 2. To a limited extent, 3. To a medium extent, 4. To a significant extent, 5. To a full extent.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p>Conflict-sensitive reporting: Refers to media coverage that avoids inflammatory language, reflects multiple perspectives, promotes social cohesion, and does not exacerbate existing tensions or divisions.</p> <p>Gender-sensitive reporting: Refers to media content that includes equitable and non-stereotyped representation of all genders, highlights gender-specific issues and experiences and fosters inclusive political participation.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breadth of media coverage: Evaluate whether reporting includes diverse actors and communities affected by the electoral process, including marginalised or at-risk groups. • Depth of analysis and framing: Assess the extent to which media go beyond superficial coverage to address underlying social, political, or gender-based issues. • Ethical and inclusive practices: Consider whether journalistic standards, such as balanced sourcing, respectful tone, and fact-based reporting, are consistently applied. • Attribution: Only include reporting by media actors or platforms that were directly supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention (e.g. training, editorial support, funding, co-production). • Survey implementation tips: Perceptions may be gathered through surveys among media audiences, electoral observers, civil society groups, or media professionals. Respondents should have had direct exposure to the media content supported by the intervention. Surveys must include a clear filter question |

and be gender-balanced. Complementary content analysis or expert validation is encouraged to reduce perception bias and improve the reliability of findings.

- **Avoid double counting:** Each media outlet or reporting initiative should be assessed only once per reporting cycle. Where multiple media entities are supported, provide a consolidated qualitative judgement, or disaggregate if relevant.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the qualitative judgement based on both conflict- and gender-sensitivity criteria?
2. Has the assessment drawn on documented evidence, such as perception surveys, content analysis, or expert feedback?
3. Was the attribution limited to media actors or platforms directly supported by the EU/FPI intervention?
4. Have respondents confirmed direct exposure to the supported media content through a clear filter question?
5. Was each media outlet or reporting initiative assessed only once per reporting cycle?

Example:

An EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X supported a network of local radio stations and online media to improve reporting on parliamentary elections, focusing on inclusion and social stability. Activities included training on gender-sensitive reporting, editorial support to avoid inflammatory narratives, and production grants for programmes covering marginalised groups. At the end of the intervention, a perception survey and external content analysis were conducted. Among 750 surveyed listeners/viewers (360 female; 370 male; 20 intersex), the combined evidence suggested that the majority perceived the reporting as balanced, inclusive, and respectful of sensitive issues, but with room for improvement in terms of intersectional gender analysis. Based on this, the overall score was reported as 4. To a significant extent, disaggregated by sex as follows: Female – 4, Male – 4, Intersex – 3.

5. Data Sources

Reported values should derive primarily from the internal monitoring systems of EU-funded interventions. Data must be collected and reported by the implementing partner and verified by the Operational Manager (OM).

Examples of data sources: Perception surveys targeting audiences or stakeholders exposed to the supported media content; Structured interviews or questionnaires used to assess perceptions of conflict and gender sensitivity in electoral reporting; Media content analysis conducted by independent experts or monitoring bodies; Project reports detailing training activities, editorial support or media outputs produced under the intervention; External evaluation reports or focus group discussions that validate or contextualise perception findings.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator can be used to assess the contribution of EU-funded interventions to fairer, more inclusive, and socially responsible electoral reporting. It may also support strategic decisions in electoral assistance, media development, and gender equality programming. Tracking this indicator over time may reveal shifts in public perception or identify persistent gaps in media practices.

Potential issues: Subjective nature of perception-based scoring, which may vary across contexts or be influenced by political polarisation, media bias, or social norms. There is also a risk of inconsistency in how “conflict-sensitive” and “gender-sensitive” reporting are interpreted. These limitations can be mitigated through standardised survey tools, complementary expert validation, and clear guidance on attribution and respondent exposure.